



SPEECH OF SENATOR FORAKER

AT THE

Republican Campaign Opening.

AT

BELLEFONTAINE, OHIO,

September 23, 1905.

FELLOW CITIZENS:

Before saying anything else, I want to congratulate Judge West upon the long life, bodily strength and extraordinary mental vigor with which he is blessed. It has been my fortune to know a good many remarkable men, but I have never known his equal for devotion to public interests, loyalty to Republican principles, and eloquent advocacy of all that is best in American life. His patience under affliction, his perseverance and his accomplishments have been an inspiration to thousands who hold him and his character in highest esteem and most grateful appreciation. I trust there may in store for him many additional years of life and that his last days may be his happiest and best.

I have noted with much satisfaction Governor Herrick's repeated announcements that he challenges and defies all critics and enemies of either himself or his administration, and that there is no charge against either that he is not ready, anxious and able to meet.

HERRICK'S MANLY STAND.

That is a manly and fearless stand for him to take. It is worthy the Governor of a great State. Such a man does not need any special help or defense. He can be relied upon to take care not only of himself, but also of his assailants.

For this reason and because of his greater familiarity with such matters, I gladly leave to him, so far at least as this occasion is concerned, the discussion of State affairs.

I do this the more readily because I have entire confidence that investigation will disclose that the public institutions have been faithfully and economically conducted; that public funds have not been wasted; that tax burdens have not been made heavier than the public good has required, and that in all respects the State is in a healthy and prosperous condition.

In all these particulars Governor Herrick has been faithful, efficient and successful. It is for this reason that it will be a pleasure to him to render an account of his stewardship. Attacks upon him will but prove opportunities to set forth the excellence of his administration.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS.

While Governor Herrick has been dealing with Ohio affairs it has been my fortune to be connected, in a humble way, as one of your representatives, with National legislation and National policies. These are not directly involved in the approaching election, but indirectly they will be importantly affected.

If Ohio should fail to give the usual Republican majority it would, in the absence of explanation, be an indication that the people are displeased with Republicanism, and that would have the double effect of discouraging Republicans and encouraging Democrats, not only in Ohio, but everywhere.

GE. H. M. 2613
This is of itself a sufficient reason for the discussion of National politics in this campaign, but there is another and a more commanding reason therefor in the fact that the platforms of the parties adopted at their respective State conventions openly join issues on National questions.

MUST APPROVE ROOSEVELT.

Therefore, when we vote in November we must, whether we wish it so or not, cast our ballots for or against not only the record that has been made at Columbus, but also for or against the record that has been made at Washington—not only for or against Herrick, but also for or against Roosevelt.

In other words, the issue, and practically the only issue we have this year, is the Republican party versus the Democratic party.

It was in recognition of this fact that, with the President's hearty approval, Secretary Taft, Ohio's distinguished member of the Cabinet, was chosen to preside at the Republican State Convention that renominated Governor Herrick and there sounded the keynote for this campaign, proclaiming directly to the voters of Ohio not only the President's views on the public questions of the day, but also his keen personal interest in Governor Herrick, and all this is to be further emphasized by other political and personal representatives of the President hereafter coming into the State and participating in this contest.

REPUBLICAN DUTY.

In view of all this, it is the duty of Republicans to support the Republican ticket in Ohio this year without regard to the personnel of the candidates, for, whatever else may be true, they stand for Roosevelt and Republicanism, and that is enough.

It is not necessary to eulogize or defend either, but it is pleasant to note that even his political opponents recognize that the war lord of last year has become the peacemaker of the world, and that Republicanism was never so universally popular as it is today.

President Roosevelt has not only met the expectations and redeemed the promises of his party, but he has so far surpassed all expectations and pledges that the Democrats are proposing that he be made the candidate of both parties and be unanimously re-elected President in 1908. This is the most sensible proposition they have advanced in fifty years.

To praise such a man would be like tying ribbons to the sun. His achievements speak for him more eloquently than any language. He is easily the greatest and most popular figure of the world.

But why and how has he become such?

Because he has been a Republican, and has been able in a great and striking way to give application and direction to Republican principles and policies. All his tremendous energy, lofty ideas and patriotic impulses would have been so much useless waste of capital if he had been a Democrat.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

That party gives no opportunity to such a man. It affords nothing for him to work on or work with. It no longer has any vitalizing doctrines. Individual Democrats are as able and high-minded today as any of their great leaders of the past have been, but they have no unity of belief or purpose. Bryan preaches one kind of Democracy and Parker another, and the people have no use for either.

Our great victory of last year was due in part to the personal popularity of President Roosevelt and the still greater popularity of Republican policies, but more than all else to the utter lack of any common beliefs or common policies or

purposes of our opponents. They never were very well endowed with principles. In all their history they have had only four cardinal propositions: slavery, secession, free trade and free silver, and now these are all dead or disabled. Slavery and secession were slaughtered on the battlefield; free trade has been relegated to the rear by protection prosperity, and free silver perished at the ballot box.

AN OPPOSITION PARTY.

All the other issues they have from time to time attempted to make have been mere temporary expedients, born of a spirit of opposition to the party in power, and consequently passing away with the settlement of the questions that prompted them.

Such was the character of Democratic opposition to the policies of reconstruction, the establishment of the National banking system, the resumption of specie payments, the annexation of Hawaii, the acquisition of the Philippines, the Porto Rican tariff, the Panama Canal, the Santo Domingo treaty, and everything else they have made the mistake of opposing.

If it were not that an opposition party is a necessary factor in popular government, it would dissolve and pass out of existence. It seems on the verge of doing so anyhow. Surely there is nothing in the past to keep it alive and not very much in the present or the future. Such a party is incapable of dealing satisfactorily with the kind of questions that now confront us.

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

They are business questions and broad American questions. Democracy never seemed to have any faculty for either. Free trade rendered it incapable as to the one, and

its strict construction views of the constitution have made it helpless as to the other. They do not lack appreciation for prosperity, but they cannot have that and free trade also. They would like to uphold and advance American interests throughout the world, but their conception of our organic law paralyzes all such forms of patriotism.

Whether the time will ever come when it will be wise to restore that party to power will have to be answered by the developments of the future. Certain it is that this is not the time. It would be most unwise to intrust it with the solution of the questions with which we are now dealing. Consider their character.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

We have entered upon the construction of the Panama Canal. It is a majestic enterprise that will tax our capabilities to the utmost. We need for its successful prosecution the very best, wisest and most energetic management possible. There is no room in connection with such a work for narrow partisan politics. It is a great American and business undertaking, and must be conducted on the broadest and most patriotic lines.

The commissioners, the engineers and the other officials in charge of the work must be the best available. Nothing short of that will be satisfactory. With President Roosevelt and Secretary Taft in charge, we know the standard of efficiency will be the highest. It is not only a privilege, but a grave duty, also, to vote to keep it so.

THE PHILIPPINES.

We are in the Philippines, and we are there to stay. What we shall do there, and how we shall do it, is a great problem, worthy of the best thought and the highest quality of

American statesmanship. We have accomplished much, but much remains to be done. So far the record is highly creditable. It will improve as time passes and experience educates us to the requirements of the case. Our honor and good name, as well as great American interests, are at stake there.

The Republican party is familiar with the work. It takes a pride in it; it has its heart in it. This is no time to cast a ballot that might be interpreted as a vote of censure and coming change of official authority and power, with Mr. Bryan or any other Democrat at the helm.

THE TARIFF DEFICIT.

It is the same as to the domestic questions that are engaging our attention.

There is a large deficit in our revenues. It amounted to \$24,000,000 last year, and present indications are that it will be larger for the current year.

We must find a way to remedy this, but what shall it be? There is much difference of opinion on this point. Economy, reciprocity and tariff revision have all been suggested.

I don't pretend to know in advance exactly what will be done, but I have entire confidence that the Republican party will do the right thing at the right time, and that the Democratic party, if it had the opportunity, would do exactly the opposite.

When Congress meets the whole subject will be carefully considered in the proper committees, and then it will, no doubt, be elaborately debated in the two houses, and out of it all will come in due time the appropriate measure.

In advance of that action I can only make predictions as to what in my opinion is likely to be done or not done.

In the first place, whether the deficit continues or not, the strictest economy consistent with the public welfare will

government in making up the appropriation bills, but the country is growing and its demands upon the public treasury are so rapidly increasing that it is doubtful if entire relief can be secured merely by retrenchment.

RECIPROCITY TREATIES.

In the second place there can not be any reciprocity treaties considered by the Senate unless the President first negotiates them and sends them there. The initiative is with him. Until he acts nobody else can. Whether he is disposed to undertake to negotiate any such treaties with any other countries, and whether such other countries are willing to agree with him on provisions that he will be willing to accept and ask the Senate to ratify, I do not know and so far as I am aware nobody else knows.

But if he should find himself able to make such treaties the Senate, I am sure, would not ratify them unless it was found on examination of their provisions that they did not seriously injure any important American industry. The platform on which President Roosevelt was elected so declared, and I do not imagine he would disregard that declaration in negotiating such a treaty, and if he did I know the Senate would not ratify or approve his action in doing so.

In short, then, reciprocity should be confined to non-competing products and to such products as are able to stand a reduction of duties without injury to the industry that produces them. Each treaty must, therefore, be tried on its own merits, according to its own provisions, and for that reason no one can tell in advance what will be done in any particular case.

We have a high duty on wheat, corn, rye, oats, barley, potatoes, butter, eggs, milk, cattle, horses, sheep, hogs,

wool, hides and almost everything else the farmer produces.

I have no doubt but for a substantial reduction on these commodities, or some of them, a reciprocity treaty could be arranged with Mexico and with Great Britain as to Canada, and with still other countries; but I do not need to state, for everybody knows it without stating, that the farmers of Ohio and the whole country would be hostile to such a treaty.

In consideration of a substantial reduction of the duties on earthenware and china, or on glass and glassware, or on brick and tile, or on cotton manufactures, or on a hundred other articles that might be named, corresponding reductions can be secured, no doubt, from other countries of duties upon our products going there, but what would the American producers who would be affected say about it? What would become of the potteries at East Liverpool, the tile plants at Zanesville and the glass factories at Toledo and other places, and what would happen to the capital and labor employed there?

CAUSE TO COMPLAIN.

They would all have just cause to complain, for such a treaty would be their ruin, if the reduction should be enough to deprive them of needed protection in the conduct of their business, and if it should be less than that it is difficult to perceive how it could avail anything to increase our revenues or widen our markets.

If we are to sacrifice the protection of any one industry to secure larger markets abroad for some other kind of American products, it will be difficult to show why we should not dispense with protection as to all and thus go at once to free trade or a purely revenue tariff, the folly

of which has been demonstrated as often as the experiment has been tried.

The difficulty of agreeing about reciprocity in competing products was demonstrated when the recent Reciprocity Convention assembled in Chicago. The delegates were chiefly prominent business men, representing the different sections of the country and almost every kind of industry.

Every man of them was enthusiastically in favor of reciprocal treaties that reduced duties at the expense of somebody else, but all alike were opposed to all treaties that reduced duties on products that competed with their respective productions.

NO CHANGES LIKELY.

The result was a virtual abandonment of reciprocity, except in noncompetitive products, and the substitution of a proposition to have a maximum and a minimum tariff, which is not new, but has been under consideration in a tentative way for several years.

What will be ultimately decided upon with respect to it can not be foretold, but it can be regarded as settled that no important changes, if any at all, are likely to be made in the tariff by treaties of any kind; certainly not for the purpose of increasing the revenues, and that we must, in consequence, find some other way than by reciprocity to make up our deficit.

REVISION OF TARIFF.

Another remedy proposed for the deficit is by a revision of the tariff.

Sooner or later there will be revision, for the Republican party, while unalterably committed to protection, is not wedded to schedules and will not hesitate to make changes in rates when changed conditions make it proper to do so.

There are, no doubt, some duties that can be changed now with resulting benefit if nothing more were to be considered than the industries to be affected; but when we touch the tariff we touch the business of the whole country, and therefore should not enter upon such a work upon slight cause, but remembering that all existing conditions must be considered when any kind of tariff legislation is enacted.

A few years ago we had a surplus. Now we have a deficit. This must be taken into the account.

It is manifestly easier to get rid of a surplus by revision than to overcome a deficit. If we had a surplus of twenty-four millions, instead of a deficit of that amount, we could easily lop off that sum by transferring dutiable articles to the free list or by reducing rates not levied or longer needed for protection.

But I do not know how we are to materially increase the aggregate of our income by reducing duties, except on the theory that we will largely increase importations.

WILL SWELL IMPORTS.

In other words, if we try in that way to make up our deficit we will have to reduce duties to such an extent as to swell importations to an amount that will make up that sum at the lower rate.

Many are claiming that the iron and steel duties in particular should be reduced. So far as mere protection or mere revenue is concerned that may be true, but such a reduction, with a view to making up the deficit, is another matter. Take these articles for illustration.

The duty on pig iron is \$4 per ton, and on steel products \$7 per ton. If we should reduce these duties 50 per cent we would have to import enough pig iron under a duty of \$2 per ton, and enough steel at \$3.50 per ton, to make up the

revenue now derived from these sources and then in addition import enough more to make up the \$24,000,000 needed, and that, it is easily seen, would be an enormous quantity of each. Five million tons of pig iron, or almost one-third of all we produce, would yield a revenue of but \$10,000,000; and 4,000,000 tons of steel, almost one-third of our entire production, would yield but \$14,000,000.

DANGER TO INDUSTRIES.

That would practically make up the deficit, but does anybody need to be told that the result would work havoc and ruin to two of our greatest industries—to their plants and the capital and labor employed in them? Does any man, except a free trader, fail to see that the experiment would cost vastly more than it would come to?

It requires no special power of prevision to see that it would disrupt and demoralize, not only the iron and steel business, but all kinds of business the whole country over.

It would work the same injury, if not worse, to the farmers of the country if we should take their products for the experiment, since nothing could be accomplished in the direction of increasing revenues, except by an increase of the importation of the farm products of other countries, and nothing is plainer than that we can not strike such a blow at agriculture without destroying the prosperity of all other industries.

It is impossible on this occasion to enter into elaborate and detailed argument, but these mere suggestions are sufficient, I trust, to show the impossibility of increasing the revenues by reducing duties, and increasing importations without at the same time doing more harm than good; but that is exactly what the free-trade proclivities of our Democratic friends would impel them to do. Everybody knows this, and that is why the whole country takes fright

whenever an important Democratic victory happens to occur.

PROTECTIVE PRINCIPLE.

It is because of such considerations as these that the Republican party favors and will favor all advantageous reciprocity treaties that can be made without serious injury to any important American industry; but, on the other hand, will oppose any other kind, just as it has declared in its platform; and will not hesitate to revise the tariff schedules either upward or downward when there is just occasion to do so, but will not lower duties to increase revenues by stimulating importations, for it believes as firmly to-day as ever in its history in the great principle of protection on which the Morrill tariff, the McKinley tariff and the Dingley tariff were all alike founded, and under all of which alike prosperity was brought to the American people, but never such prosperity as we are blessed with at this particular time.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, our exports amounted to \$1,518,561,720 and our imports to \$1,117,512,629, leaving a net balance of trade in our favor of \$401,049,091.

For the past year our exports have increased over the preceding year \$57,734,449, while our imports have increased over those of the preceding year \$126,425,258.

These are eloquent figures. They show a healthy foreign trade. It would be hard to improve the situation they represent, but easy to destroy it. A long first step in that direction would be a Democratic victory in Ohio this year.

If other countries enter upon a tariff war with us, as has been threatened, we may have trouble to maintain and increase our markets as our rapidly increasing production demands, but it will only emphasize our need for the wis-

dom of the Republican party, which will prove equal to the task, as it has to all other tasks it has undertaken.

We have just reached the end of a tariff war with Russia, with the result that the United States has been completely vindicated both as to her legislation and her action under that legislation. We have done nothing and do not propose to do anything in the levying of tariff duties, except only that which is in accordance with the recognized rights of our Government to provide for the best interests of our people. No country has a right to complain of such a policy and no country will long persist in legislation that is based on a spirit of reprisal or punishment.

RAILROAD LEGISLATION.

Another domestic business question has arisen with respect to the railroads. It has been charged that freight rates are too high; that rebates are secretly given and that discriminations are practiced, and it is proposed that all these evils shall be cured by conferring the rate-making power on the Interstate Commerce Commission.

A great deal of testimony has been taken of shippers and railroad officials and experts, and many interesting and valuable statistics have been gathered.

From this evidence it appears that there are various kinds of practices and abuses that should be prohibited, and there will no doubt be legislation of that character at the approaching session of Congress, for there can be no question about the power or wisdom of appropriate regulation of the railroad business of the country. But it also appears that the United States is much more fortunate in her railways than any other country.

The following article, based on an official bulletin issued by the Department of Commerce and Labor, appeared in The Cincinnati Enquirer a few days ago:

"Compilations made from foreign and domestic statistics show a freight rate on English roads per mineral ton-mile of 1.93 cent. A ton-mile of merchandise or live stock costs 2.94 cents, and on all commodities an average of 2.32 cents. Against these the figures for the United States are startlingly small, being 0.58 cent. On German roads it is 1.42 cent, on French 1.55 cent, Austrian 1.16 cent and Hungarian 1.30 cent.

RATES IN ENGLAND.

England's passenger rates per mile, according to the business magazine, on the same classes as there cited for the United States, were 4 cents, Germany's 3.8 cents. For their average day's wages workmen can travel as follows: American 65 miles, British 35 miles. German 53 miles, French 40 miles, Belgian 36 miles. Italian 38 miles and East Indian 21 miles.

On American roads locomotive engineers average \$4 a day, England \$1.62, Belgian \$1.01; American firemen get \$2.28 a day, British 91 cents, Belgian 72 cents. Railroad laborers in the United States get from two to four times as much as on foreign roads. Forty per cent. of the gross earnings of American railroads goes to labor, while only 25 per cent. goes to capital. In England labor gets 27 per cent., capital 38 per cent.; in Germany the division is equal."

It will be noted that rates are much lower in this country than in any other, although labor and other costs of operation are much higher. Shippers and railroad men alike confirm these statistics by testifying that rates in this country are on the average as low as could be expected, especially for long distances.

QUESTION OF REBATES.

With rates not higher than what is reasonable and just under all circumstances shippers are next most concerned about rebates. Every man wants to know, and has a right

to know, that he is treated precisely as all his fellow-shippers are treated; that his competitors do not receive a preference that will enable them to undersell him and break him up and drive him out of business. For years the giving of such rebates was a common practice, resorted to by railroads in their competition with each other for freight traffic. Its unjust and ruinous consequences were universally felt.

To remedy this evil, with others, in February, 1903, the Congress passed what is commonly known as the Elkins law. The provisions of this measure were carefully considered and framed with a view to breaking up and destroying the whole rebate system, to the end that all shippers might enjoy the same rights and be treated with absolute equality in the use of the railroads of the country for interstate commerce.

It is very gratifying to be able now to state that railroad men and shippers alike testify with substantial unanimity that the law has been so successful in its operation that the granting of rebates has been practically discontinued, or that, if not wholly discontinued, the law has been found, by practical tests of its efficiency, to be ample, if properly enforced, to thoroughly accomplish its purpose.

DISCRIMINATIONS MADE.

The remaining ground of complaint is that discriminations are practiced.

There are so many forms of discrimination that this charge is a very broad and serious one. There may be discriminations between individuals, between commodities and between localities. They may be practiced by giving rebates, by classification, by false weights, by refusing or neglecting to furnish cars equally and alike to all shippers, by allowing terminal charges, elevator charges, or by

inequalities of rates as between different points, by charges for private cars, refrigerator cars, icing charges, etc.

The methods and devices resorted to are so numerous that it is almost impossible to enumerate them, but for every such discrimination, no matter how practiced, the law as it now stands was intended to provide a remedy.

The difficulty is not, therefore, with the spirit of the law, but with its text. The statutes applicable can be made much more explicit and effective, and as a result of the investigations that have been made and the consideration that has been given to this subject there will undoubtedly be appropriate legislation enacted at the next session of Congress to prohibit and punish in so far as it may be possible so to provide, all these discriminating abuses.

MANY ONLY APPARENT.

But the truth is that, while there are many kinds of discriminations to be complained of, there are, on the other hand, many alleged discriminations that investigation has shown are only apparent.

For instance, the rate on freight from New York to San Francisco is less than half what it is from New York to Denver and other intermediate places, practically only half the distance. By comparison this looks like willful discrimination and extortion as against these intermediate points, but it isn't.

There is a good reason for what at first thought seems so inexcusable.

It has been shown that the rates to these intermediate points do not yield to the railroads more than a fair return for the service rendered; that they are not only reasonable, measured by that standard, but that they are much lower than the rates charged for a similar service in any other country.

The explanation for the difference is in the fact that the through rates to San Francisco are unreasonably low, due to the fact that the shipper from New York has an option to ship by water, and the railroads must accept the low rates charged for water transportation for the through haul or else lose the business altogether, and they prefer, inasmuch as they must make the haul anyhow, to take the business at these low rates rather than lose it altogether, notwithstanding if they could not make up for it elsewhere they would be bankrupted.

CINCINNATI INSTANCE.

Cincinnati affords another illustration. That city is situated only about one-half the distance from Atlanta that New York is from Atlanta, yet New York has practically as low an all-rail rate to Atlanta as Cincinnati has, but why? Not because the railroads want to discriminate against Cincinnati, but because the New York shipper has the advantage of water transportation, with its low rates, for the greater part of the distance to the near-by points on the coast.

Illustrations might be multiplied almost without number to show that what appear to be discriminations are in many instances found on investigation to be due to the law of competition and the result of natural forces and conditions, over which neither Congress nor the railroads have any control.

There are, however, many cases for which there is no such excuse, and for which we must and will provide an effective remedy. But it does not follow that to remedy these abuses the rate-making power should be conferred on the Interstate Commerce Commission, as the Ohio Democratic platform of this year proposes.

I believe such a provision is unnecessary to correct the

evils complained of and that it would be both unwise and unjust.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is composed of five very capable, upright gentlemen, who have rendered good service, but neither they nor any other similar body, acting, as they must act, could satisfactorily discharge such a duty.

The Supreme Court said, as to the rate-making power, in what is known as the maximum rate case that, on account of

“the large amount of property invested in railroads, the various companies engaged therein, the thousands of miles of road, and the millions of tons of freight carried, the varying and diverse conditions attaching to such a right, is a power of supreme delicacy and importance.”

The rate making is probably the most complicated and difficult work connected with transportation. The railroads employ for this work the brightest and most skillful men they can find. These men command large salaries and earn them. Their work is of scientific character. It can not be done except by experts.

The railroad systems of the country have probably more than 5,000 in their employment to-day doing nothing else but making transportation rates for the traffic that is being hauled. Their work extends from ocean to ocean.

CONCERNS EVERY SECTION.

It embraces every section, every commodity, every condition, every classification. It is their business not only to make rates that will yield proper revenue to the railroads, but also from time to time so to reduce, alter and change rates as to develop the country through which the respective roads pass, encourage new industries along their lines, meet new competitors that come into their territory,

and from year to year, and month to month, and week to week, and day to day, and almost hour to hour meet the ever rapidly changing conditions that are brought about through the natural operation of the forces of trade and commerce.

They must, of necessity, meet as nearly as possible the requirements of their patrons. They must, therefore, not only make rates as low as justice to the railroads will allow, but they must make them interdependent, so that shippers can with facility send their products throughout the whole country.

A better way may be found of making these rates than that which is now in vogue, but I do not believe it possible for Congress to provide it by entrusting such a complicated, delicate and vitally important duty to any such agency of its creation as is that which has been proposed.

There are serious legal questions involved in such a proposition. There are numerous difficulties of a practical character that must arise the moment the Government undertakes such a duty.

It is impossible on this occasion to take up these objections in detail. I content myself, therefore, with one or two general observations.

FREIGHT BUSINESS DOUBLED.

During the last eight years the freight business of the country has doubled in volume. In consequence there has been and is now a congested condition everywhere with respect to the transportation of freight, and the railroads in consequence have been driven to the necessity of lowering grades, straightening curves, enlarging tunnels, strengthening bridges, multiplying equipment and increasing motive power to enable them to meet the demands upon them of the business of the country.

For improvements of this character they are shown to have expended during the last eight years the enormous sum of \$1,500,000,000.

From one end of the land to the other this kind of work is now in progress. If this increase of business continues for eight years more at the same rate of progression, and the indications are that it will, it will be impossible for the railroads to handle it, unless in the meantime, in addition to the general improvements mentioned, they double and quadruple their main lines, or double and quadruple their existing tracks and equipment.

OF VITAL INTEREST.

In this work we are all vitally interested. We want it to go forward without let or hindrance, to the end that business may be conveniently and economically transacted, and also and especially that there may be the greatest possible safety for life and limb to the millions who travel. We should take heed, therefore, that we do not destroy or impair the enterprise or the credit and financial ability of the railroads to raise and expend, in the way indicated, the hundreds of millions necessary to carry forward this great work.

To take control of the rate-making power is to take charge of the revenue of the roads, and that means that the Government is to assume the responsibility, not only of determining what rates shall be charged, but also of necessity how much money a railroad shall be allowed to make, and thus determine, also, of necessity, what improvements it shall be permitted to make, what extensions it may build, what equipment it must provide, what new tracks it may lay and what kind of service it shall render, for rates are so interdependent that there is no such thing possible as changing one without affecting many.

DELUSION IS REFUTED.

Any other notion is a delusion refuted by conditions and experience. In short, if the Government is to determine how much money a railroad shall be allowed to make it must of necessity determine, also, what expenditures shall be permitted. None of these things can be escaped and none of them can be done by the Government so well as they are now being done by the companies themselves.

Such has been the experience of every country that has undertaken such a task, and will be ours also under similar circumstances.

The time was, and not very long ago, when it was a maxim recognized and advocated by all political parties, but especially by the Democratic party, that that country was best governed that was least governed. Now the tendency seems to be in the opposite direction; for every ill, real or imaginary, from which we may suffer, governmental relief or control is sought. Much good has been accomplished in this way, but the pendulum should not be allowed to swing too far.

Liberty of trade and commerce is the life that imparts competition and secures a healthy and vigorous development of our resources. If it be unduly hampered and restricted greater evils will result than any we are striving to escape.

REPUBLICANS KNOW DUTY.

At another time I shall pursue this subject further. My only purpose now is to indicate the serious character of what is proposed and the necessity for the most intelligent and considerate solution of the difficult problem.

The Republican party is alive to its duty in this respect and will not desist from its efforts until it has worked out the best possible results.

We have 212,000 miles of railroads in the United States, and they have issued for their construction, equipment, improvement and maintenance \$16,000,000,000 in round numbers of railroad bonds, stocks and other securities, most of which are now held by our own citizens.

All classes of people and all kinds of business are interested in the subject and will be affected, favorably or unfavorably, by whatever may be done. A false step might work the most serious injury to the country's welfare and the people's prosperity.

It is not necessary to say that the Democratic party is incapable of satisfactorily dealing with such a complicated and difficult problem, because it is sufficient for present purposes and more agreeable, to say only that the Republican party is far better qualified for this most important work.

If this be true we shall prove unfaithful to ourselves if we do not continue it in power, for it is our duty to all interests involved and to the country as a whole to choose at this time, as well as at other times, the most acceptable agency that can be secured for the administration of our public affairs."

